at least once daily until symptoms are reversed" and "approximately 50 mg." The prior art cited by Examiner, Mak et al. (US 2002/0198136 A1), rather than making obvious the present invention, conversely teaches away from this approach. Mak's claims teach a dosing procedure that is much more of a burden on the patient, namely "[t]he method of claim 39, wherein said compound is delivered continuously." (Claim 46) This continuous dosing procedure would result in more inconvenience and expense to the patient, while the more exact dosing requirements taught in the present invention would ease these burdens.

In view of the above, it is submitted that Claims 4 - 7 are in a condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and objections under section 103 are hereby requested. Allowance of Claims 4 - 7 at an early date is solicited.

If impediments to allowance of Claims 4 - 7 remain and a telephone conference between the undersigned and the examiner would help remove such impediments in the opinion of the examiner, a telephone conference is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

David G. Henry

Registration No. 32,735 L

900 Washington Ave.

P.O. Box 1470

Waco, TX 76703-1470

(254) 755-4234

(254) 754-6331 (Fax)

henry@namanhowell.com



## **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this the 12 day of January, 2004.

Christina M. Hillson